

REMARKS

Claim 11 calls for a packetization device to independently packetize at least two moving picture video streams in different frame rates.

The rejection suggests that the packetization device is in the encoder 8 in Figure 5. However, it should be noted that the encoder 8 comes in the stream after the input signal monitoring unit 3. That unit 3 does not receive all the video streams. Instead, it selects one video stream, as indicated by the arrow from the camera 1-2 to the input signal monitoring unit 3. See column 7, lines 26-38. There, it is explained that only one frame is selected from one camera.

The goal is obviously to compose the array of still pictures shown in Figures 2A-2D. There are no moving pictures, but, instead, a series of stills collated into one picture from as many as four cameras.


The way this is done is better explained in the cited Figure 12 and in the specification at column 13, lines 41-56. As shown in Figure 12, the video signals 1-4 have different frame rates. In order to select the signals successively from the moving picture streams, one frame is pulled successively from each stream. Thus, from the video signal stream number 1, the first frame is taken out and from the video signal 2 the second frame is taken out. From the video signal stream 3 its fourth frame is taken out and from the video signal stream 4 its fifth stream is taken out. The reason that these particular frames are selected is that this technique enables a clean frame to be extracted after extracting the previous frame from the previous stream. Thus, in the case of video stream 3, its frame 3 was skipped because it occurred during some of the time that frame 2 occurred in video signal stream 2.

Thus, what is encoded in the encoder 8 is a series of stills or signal frames pulled from the various streams. Thus, the packetization device asserted to be in the item number 8 in Figure 5 does not independently packetize two moving picture video streams. Instead, if anything, it packetizes a series of displaced single frames that cannot be called moving picture video streams and no longer have any frame rate.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 20, 2006



Timothy N. Trop
Registration No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation